

10/539863

JC06 Rec'd PCT/PTO 17 JUN 2005

IPEA  
EPO  
D-80298 Munich  
Germany

1<sup>st</sup> February 2005

Dear Sir

PCT/GB03/05598  
Our ref: QoS (PCT)

Thank you for your Written Opinion dated 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2004. The Opinion is an auto-generated Opinion which states in essence that the invention as claimed lacks novelty and/or inventive step in light of the art cited in the Search Report.

The Search Report cites 1 category X documents against the independent claims:

**D1** WO 0178319 (Research in Motion)

In light of the citations, the applicant files replacement pages as follows:

Replacement page 3 to replace pages as originally filed

Replacement pages 50 - 53 to replace pages 50 - 53 as originally filed.

Triplicate copies will follow by post, together with one set marked to show all changes.

Amended Claim 1 now reads:

1. Method of automatically replicating data objects between a mobile device and a server, connected together via a wireless network, in which the timing of data replication across the network is determined by a network operator applying parameters that make efficient usage of network bandwidth; characterised in that:

---

Origin Limited  
Twisden Works, Twisden Road, London NW5 1DN  
E-mail: peter.langley@origin.co.uk

Tel: +44 (0)20 7424 1950 Fax: +44 (0)20 7209 0643  
www.origin.co.uk Registration no. 2211999

Origin is a law firm regulated by The Law Society. A List of Directors is available at the above address.

- (i) a change log lists all objects at the device and/or server to be replicated and the parameters then comprise a weight associated with each object that defines how urgently that object needs to be replicated; and
- (ii) the parameters further comprise a threshold that is a function of time, with the weight of each object being locally compared to the threshold at a given time and the outcome of the comparison determining whether the object is sent for replication or not at that time.

The amendments comprise including the subject matter of Claims 2, 3 and 4 into original Claim 1. **D1** entirely fails to disclose or suggest the subject matter now included in Claim 1.

In the light of the above arguments and amendments, re-consideration of the present application is requested. Should the examiner require further clarification, a second Written Opinion is requested.

Yours faithfully,

Peter Langley